

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended, and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1-9, 18-26 and 35-60 are presently presented for prosecution, Claim 49 having been amended, and Claims 10-17, 27-34 and 61-74 having been withdrawn from consideration.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 18-22, 35-39, 45-53 and 58-60 were rejected as being anticipated by Basting et al (U.S. Patent 6,014,206, hereinafter Basting), and Claims 6, 9, 23-26, 40-44 and 54-57 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter.

With regard to the rejection of independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 1 is directed to a method that includes steps of (1) measuring an outgoing angle of a light emitted from a light-emitting element, and (2) orienting said light-emitting element based on said outgoing angle.

In contrast to Claim 1, Basting does not reorient the laser device 10. Rather, Basting relies on a beam steering unit 200 that “provides a means to adjust both the angular and lateral positions of the beam 25” (col. 9, lines 1-3). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Basting neither teaches nor suggests the step of orienting the light-emitting element based on the outgoing angle. Because Claims 2-5, 7 and 8 depend from Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over Basting. For substantially the same reasons as set forth with regard to Claim 1, it is also submitted that Claims 18-22, 35-39, 45-48 also patentably define over Basting.

Turning to independent Claim 49, Claim 49 has been amended to require that the position of the at least one optical component is based only on the far field pattern. This feature is different than that disclosed in Basting, which relies on two different components in order to do beam adjustment. Moreover, Basting describes that adjusting of the output beam is performed by first detecting at a near field location a lateral position of the beam, and then detecting at a far field location so as to determine the angular direction of the beam. (see e.g., Basting, col. 2, lines 53-59). As described at col. 6, lines 50-56, Basting describes a device that “effectively probes the laser output beam 21 at two locations that are at significantly different optical distances from the laser output aperture 20”. Moreover, at col. 6, lines 53-57, Basting describes that “one component 22, . . . is probed at an optically near field location, and the other component 23 . . . is probed at an optically far field location”.

In contrast to Basting, the invention defined by Claim 49, as amended, is directed to a method that includes a step of positioning the at least one optical component based only on the far field pattern. Basting describes the need to have two different measurements taken at two different locations. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Basting neither teaches nor suggests the invention of independent claim 49.

Because Claims 50-53 and 58-60 dependent from Claim 49, it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over Basting.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-9, 18-26 and 35-60, as amended is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

Bradley D. Lytle
Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
GJM:BDL\la

I:\ATTY\BDL\201085US\201085US-AM.DOC